

Appl. No. 10/632,082  
Response dated: July 14, 2006  
Reply to Office action of May 5, 2006

### REMARKS

In response to the Final Office action dated May 5, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-13 and 29-35 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1, 29 and 35 have been amended and Claim 36 is new, leaving Claims 1-13 and 29-36 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks.

Support for the amendments to the claims can at least be found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Oyokota et al., JP 2002-132193A (hereinafter "Oyokota"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Barient, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Moreover, the single source must disclose all of the claimed elements "arranged as in the claim." *Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d 707, 716, 223 U.S.P.Q. 1264, 1271 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

It is respectfully submitted that Oyokota discloses a lighting installation that is constituted to illuminate an object for illumination from its rear with the transmitted light from the cold cathode fluorescent tubes [2] having electrodes at each of both ends in the axial direction of the tubes by impressing high-frequency voltages from inverter circuits to the fluorescent tubes [2]. The plurality of the fluorescent tubes [2] are disposed nearly parallel to each other and circuit boards 14 formed with the inverter circuits are disposed at each one-side end of the plurality of the fluorescent tubes [2] or near the same and the high-frequency output side output terminals Vo of the inverter circuits are connected to the electrodes disposed to each one-side end of the fluorescent tubes [2]. (Abstract). Oyokota further discloses with reference

Appl. No. 10/632,082  
Response dated: July 14, 2006  
Reply to Office action of May 5, 2006

to FIGS. 1 and 3 thereof that one end of each lamp [2] is disposed in a corresponding groove [9a] of a lamp holder rail [9] and sandwiched with another lamp holder rail [10]. A pair of stacked inverter circuit substrates [14] are disposed over a respective lamp holder with a member [11] disposed therebetween. FIG. 5 of Oyokota discloses a side lead wire [21] extending from an electrode [20] on each of opposite ends of each lamp [2] for connection with a respective one of the two inverter circuit substrates [14].

Oyokota does not teach or suggest, a first board that makes contact with the first lamp holder, the first board having a flat plate shape and being coupled to the first electrode to provide the first electrode with the first discharge voltage, the first electrode extending through the first board to an opposite surface thereof, as in amended Claim 1 and similarly claimed in amended Claim 29. Thus, Claims 1 and 29, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., Claims 2-13 and 30-36, define over Oyokota.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1, 7 and 13 under § 102(b) be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oyokota in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,504,891 (hereinafter "Mazis"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fina*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

First it is respectfully noted that Claims 2-5 depend from Claim 1, which is submitted as being allowable for defining over Oyokota as discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that use of the first board disclosed in Mazis does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Oyokota.

Appl. No. 10/632,082  
Response dated: July 14, 2006  
Reply to Office action of May 5, 2006

Moreover, the Examiner admits on page 4 of the present Office Action that Oyokota does not disclose the first board having at least two first through-holes formed on the insulated body, whereby the each of the first through-holes receives the first electrode of each of the lamps. However, the Examiner alleges that FIG. 3 of Mazis teaches a first board [44]; at least one first conductive pattern [45] electrically connected to the first electrode of the plurality of lamps; and at least two first through-holes [46] formed on the insulated body.

However, it is respectfully submitted that the lamp system of Mazis teaches that the regions of the conductive strips 45 on the wiring plate 44 which contact the socket contacts 28 are shown as 46. (Col. 3, lines 55-57.) Thus, reference numeral "46" of Mazis discloses a conductive strip, not a through-hole as alleged by the Examiner.

Neither Oyokota nor Mazis, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest, the first electrode extending through the first board to an opposite surface thereof; and . . . at least two first through-holes formed on the first insulated body, each of the first through-holes receiving the first electrode of each of the lamps, as in Claim 2. Thus, Claim 2, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., Claims 3-5, define over Oyokota in view of Mazis.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 2-5 under § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oyokota in view of Mazis and further in view of Saito, U.S. Patent No. 6,441,874 (hereinafter "Saito") as applied to Claim 1, and Claims 8-11 are rejected over Oyokota as applied to Claim 7 above, all further in view of Mazis. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oyokota as applied to Claim 7 above, and further in view of Mazis in view of Saito. Claims 29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oyokota in view of Mazis. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Dependent claims inherit all of the limitations of the respective parent claim.

Claims 6, 8-12 and 29-36 variously depend from Claims 1 and 29. As discussed above, Oyokota and Mazis do not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, at least all of the limitations of at least amended Claims 1 and 29. Saito also does not teach at least all of the limitations of amended Claims 1 and 29. Therefore, Saito does not remedy the deficiencies of

Appl. No. 10/632,082  
Response dated: July 14, 2006  
Reply to Office action of May 5, 2006

Oyokota and Mazis with respect to amended Claims 1 and 29. Accordingly, Oyokota, Mazis and Saito do not teach all of the limitations of Claims 6, 8-12 and 29-36.

Since Oyokota, Mazis and Saito, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of at least Claims 6, 8-12 and 29-36, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding Claims 6, 8-12 and 29-36 with respect to the Oyokota, Mazis and Saito patents.

Additionally, since Oyokota, Mazis and Saito fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claims 6, 8-12 and 29-36, clearly, one of ordinary skill at the time of Applicants' invention would not have a motivation to modify or combine the references, or a reasonable likelihood of success in forming the claimed invention by modifying or combining the references. Thus, here again, *prima facie* does not exist.

Thus, *prime facie* obviousness does not exist regarding Claims 6, 8-12 and 29-36 with respect to the Oyokota, Mazis and Saito patents. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 6, 8-12 and 29-36 are not further rejected or objected and are therefore allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 6, 8-12 and 29-36 is respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.